



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.461 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24.07.2023

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **R.SAKTHIVEL**

H.C.P.No.461 of 2023

Seenath

.. Petitioner

VS

1 The State Represented

by its Secretary to Government, Home
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Coimbatore, Coimbatore District

3. The Superintendent of Prison
Coimbatore, Central Prison, Coimbatore

4. The Superintendent of Police
Coimbatore District

5. The Inspector of Police
Madukkarai Police Station, Coimbatore

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying
for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records relating to
petitioner's son namely Abdul Rashik, son of Mohamed Haneefa, aged



H.C.P.No.461 of 2023

about 22 years under Act 14/1982 vide detention order dated 12.01.2023 on the file of the second respondent made in Proceedings in Cr.M.P.No.02/D.O/2023, quash the same, consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the body and person of Abdul Rashik, son of Mohamed Haneefa, aged about 22 years, who is lodged at Central Prison, Coimbatore before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sathrack
for Mr.C.D.Sugumar

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by M.SUNDAR, J.]

When the captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' [hereinafter 'HCP' for the sake of convenience and clarity] was listed in the Admission Board on 28.03.2023, this Court made the following order:

' Captioned Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed in this Court on 15.03.2023 inter alia assailing a detention order dated 12.01.2023 bearing reference Cr.M.P.No.02/D.O/2023/E1 made by 'second respondent' [hereinafter 'Detaining Authority' for the sake of convenience and clarity]. To be noted, fifth respondent is the Sponsoring Authority.



H.C.P.No.461 of 2023

2. *Mother of the detenu is the petitioner.*

3. *Learned counsel for petitioner submits that ground case qua the detenu is for alleged offences under Sections 8(c) read with 22(c), 25 of 'the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985' [hereinafter 'NDPS Act' for the sake of convenience and clarity] in Crime No.198 of 2022 on the file of K.G.Chavadi Police Station.*

4. *The aforementioned detention order has been made on the premise that the detenu is a 'Drug Offender' under Section 2(e) of 'The Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber law offenders, Drug-offenders, Forest-offenders, Goondas, Immoral traffic offenders, Sand-offenders, Sexual-offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act No.14 of 1982)' [hereinafter 'Act 14 of 1982' for the sake of convenience and clarity].*

5. *The detention order has been assailed inter alia on the ground that there is delay of 102 days in passing the detention order.*

6. *Prima facie case made out for admission. Admit. Issue Rule nisi returnable by four weeks.*

7. *Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, State of Tamil Nadu accepts notice for all respondents. List the captioned Habeas Corpus Petition accordingly.'*

2. The aforementioned order made in the 28.03.2023 Admission listing shall be read as an integral part and parcel of this order which



H.C.P.No.461 of 2023

means that the short forms, short references and abbreviations used in the order in the Admission listing shall be used in the instant order also.

3. There is no adverse case and one ground case. The ground case which constitutes substantial part of substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.198 of 2022 on the file of K.G.Chavadi Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 8(c) read with 22(c) and 25 of NDPS Act. Owing to the nature of the challenge to the impugned preventive detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the factual matrix or be detained further by facts.

4. Mr.S.Sathrack, learned counsel representing the counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for all respondents are before us.

5. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that 'live and proximate link' between the grounds of detention and purpose of detention has snapped as date of remand in the ground case is 01.10.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 12.01.2023.

6. Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor, submits to the contrary by saying that materials had to be collected and time was consumed for the same. Considering the facts and



H.C.P.No.461 of 2023

circumstances of the case and nature of ground case, we find that this explanation of learned State Additional Public Prosecutor is unacceptable.

7. We remind ourselves of **Sushanta Kumar Banik's** case [**Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura & others reported in 2022 LiveLaw (SC) 813 : 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1333**]. To be noted, **Banik** case law arose under 'Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 19461' [hereinafter 'PIT NDPS Act' for the sake of brevity] in Tirupura, wherein after considering the proposal by the Sponsoring Authority and after noticing the trajectory the matter took, Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the 'live and proximate link between grounds of detention and purpose of detention snapping' point should be examined on a case to case basis. Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in **Banik** case law that this point has two facets. One facet is 'unreasonable delay' and other facet is 'unexplained delay'. We find that the captioned matter falls under latter facet i.e., unexplained delay.

8. To be noted, **Banik** case has been respectfully followed by this Court in **Gomathi Vs.The Principal Secretary to Government and**



H.C.P.No.461 of 2023

WEB COURT

others reported vide Neutral Citation of Madras High Court being **2023/MHC/334, Sadik Basha Yusuf Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu and others** reported vide Neutral Citation of Madras High Court being **2023/MHC/733, Sangeetha Vs. The Secretary to the Government and others** reported vide Neutral Citation of Madras High Court being **2023:MHC:1110, N.Anitha Vs. The Secretary to Government and others** reported vide Neutral Citation of Madras High Court being **2023:MHC:1159** and a series of other orders in HCP cases.

9.To be noted, the sole substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is a solitary case viz., Crime No.198 of 2022 on the file of K.G.Chavadi Police Station for alleged offences *inter alia* under Sections 8(c) read with Sections 22(c) and 25 of NDPS Act.

10. Before concluding, we also remind ourselves that preventive detention is not a punishment and HCP is a high prerogative writ.

11. Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned detention order dated 12.01.2023 bearing reference Cr.M.P.No.02/D.O/2023/E1 made by the second respondent is set aside



H.C.P.No.461 of 2023

and the detenu Thiru.Abdul Rashik, aged 22 years, son of Thiru.Mohamed Haneefa, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in connection with any other case / cases. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.S.,J.) (R.S.V.,J.)
24.07.2023

Index : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

gpa

P.S: Registry to forthwith communicate this order to Jail authorities in Central Prison, Coimbatore.

To

1. Secretary to Government, Home
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Coimbatore, Coimbatore District
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Coimbatore, Central Prison, Coimbatore
4. The Superintendent of Police
Coimbatore District
5. The Inspector of Police
Madukkarai Police Station, Coimbatore
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.461 of 2023

**M.SUNDAR, J.,
and
R.SAKTHIVEL, J.,**

gpa

H.C.P.No.461 of 2023

24.07.2023